

MINUTES OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
AUGUST 20, 2008
1:00 P.M.

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

2. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

ABSENT: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

ALSO PRESENT: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The Board was presented with a proposed agenda for this meeting. On motion by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) seconded by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), the Agenda was adopted. On roll call vote: YES - (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). NO - None. ABSENT: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

4. NEW APPOINTED BOARD MEMBER

Pursuant to Miss. Code Ann. §79-11-269 (1988), Board Member (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) asked that the minutes reflect that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) is currently employed by the Corporation. The employment relationship between (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and the Corporation pre-existed his appointment to the Board of Directors. Board Member (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) do not live in the same household and neither receives financial support from the other. To avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest, Board Member (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) asked that the matter be approved and considered by the Board before he formally participated in any decision by the Corporation as a Board Member. If approved, Board Member (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) will hereafter abstain from consideration of any salary or benefits to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). It was moved by Board Member (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and seconded by Board Member (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) that the Corporation finds that Board Member (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) has disclosed the material facts of his relationship with an employee of the Corporation, that the Board finds that the relationship does not present a prohibited conflict of interest and that proposed action by Board Member (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) is fair to the Corporation. Upon roll call the vote was Yes: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). No: None. Absent: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). Abstain: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). The president declared the motion carried.

5. APPROVAL AND SIGNING OF THE MINUTES.

The proposed minutes of the July 31 meeting was circulated among the board for review. On motion by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), seconded by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), the minutes of the meetings were approved. On roll call vote: YES - (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). NO - None. ABSENT: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

6. SUBDIVISION

During the last meeting it was decided that letters would be sent to Eley Engineering and the Bolivar County Planning Committee requesting copies of all documents they have on the subdivisions. These letters were passed around for board approval. On a Motion by (b) (6), (b) (7) seconded by (b) (6), the letters were approved and signed by Pres (b) (6), (b) (7). On roll call vote: YES - (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), and (b) (6), (b) (7) NO - None. ABSENT: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

7. TANK INSPECTION

We sent (b) (6), (b) (7) a letter requesting to use money in the savings account for the tank inspections. (b) (6), (b) (7) sent a letter denying that request. This is one of the few things that we were written up on during our yearly inspection. On a Motion by (b) (6) and seconded by (b) (6), we will send (b) (6), (b) (7) a second letter asking him to reconsider. These tanks must be inspected at least every five years under MDHS guidelines.

On roll call vote: YES- (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (6). NO - None. ABSENT (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

8. MISSING PIPE

(b) (6), (b) (7) has reported to me he recently went to install a new meter for the New Morning Star Church located on Hwy 448 Benoit. After two different days attempting to find the water line he called a previous employee of the system to help him locate the line. He informed (b) (6) the lines were never put in. Before the church officials filled out their user agreement and paid their \$400.00 for a new meter the as built maps were checked to make sure a water line was indeed on that side of the road. The map indicated yes. The map shows a water line on both sides of the highway. However, we now know this is not the case. We have a situation of federal funds having been approved to put this line in. The engineer ordered this line put in and put it on his as built maps submitted to MSDH. It is not right this church should now be responsible for the expense of a road bore across state Hwy 448. After talking to (b) (6), (b) (7) with Eley Engineering a rough estimate for this job would be \$2500.00 to \$3000.00. Our solution to the problem is for Boyle-Skene Water to pay for this job using funds from the reserve account since this was not a budgeted expense. We would also request a full investigation by the federal authorities into this situation. As we have previously reported to RDA we have water lines in places not on the as built maps or approved by MSDH. All of these unaccounted for lines in these private subdivisions and other places were put in during the same time frame as the Benoit expansion. We feel this warrants a full investigation. On a Motion by (b) (6), and seconded by (b) (6), (b) (7) a letter will be sent to (b) (6), (b) (7) explaining the situation and asking for his help on this matter. On roll call vote: YES- (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (6). NO - None. ABSENT- (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

9. APPROVAL OF FINANCIAL REPORT, RATIFICATION OF EXPENSES PAID PRIOR TO THE REGULAR MEETING AND/OR SPECIAL EXPENSE PAID PRIOR TO THE REGULAR MEETING PURSUANT TO BOARD POLL and APPROVAL OF PENDING BILLS.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) presented a financial statement consisting of fund balances, bills and salaries paid to date, and bills proposed for payment. A general discussion was held concerning several specific bills (Griffith and Griffith, and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)-CPA). Griffith and Griffith bill has time spent on the Boone subdivision included in it. On motion by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and seconded by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) we will pay \$2340 to Griffith and Griffith but they must bill Boone for the work done for his subdivision. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) has sent a bill for the work he did on the 2006 and 2007 audit. The bill totaled over \$8,000. The board asks (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to talk to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and see if we could get that bill reduced. On a Motion by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and second by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) the financial report, bills paid to date and bills proposed for payment were approved. On roll call vote: YES - (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) NO - None. ABSENT: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

10. ADJOURNMENT

On motion by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and second by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) the meeting was adjourned by unanimous approval of the board.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED.

Board Approval:

ATTEST: _____

Secretary